

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-7728**

---

CHARLES EDWARD FORRESTER, JR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

DAVID GARRAGHTY, Warden, Greenville  
Correctional Center; MICHAEL GAINES, Chairman,  
United States Parole Commission; ODIE  
WASHINGTON, In his official capacity as  
Director, D.C. Department of Corrections,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T. S. Ellis, III, District  
Judge. (CA-01-1366-AM)

---

Submitted: June 30, 2003

Decided: July 18, 2003

---

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Charles Edward Forrester, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Lawrence Joseph  
Leiser, Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Charles Edward Forrester, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2000). An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2241 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue for claims addressed by a district court absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find both that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 123 S. Ct. 1029, 1040 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Forrester has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED